

*Note. —This resolution is final but subject to formal revision before publication in the Bulletin. Please notify the General Counsel of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections may be made before the Bulletin is published.*

**BOARD OF STANDARDS AND APPEALS**

**MEETING OF:** May 21, 2024  
**CALENDAR NOS.:** 2020-51-BZ, 2020-53-BZ, 2020-52-A, & 2020-54-A  
**PREMISES:** 95 & 105 Ridgeway Avenue, Staten Island Block 2610, Lot 150

**ACTION OF BOARD — Application granted on condition.**

**THE VOTE —**

**Affirmative: Chair Chanda, Vice-Chair Scibetta,  
Commissioner Ottley-Brown, Commissioner Sheta, and  
Commissioner Yoon.....5**  
**Negative:..... 0**

**THE RESOLUTION —**

The decisions of the Department of Buildings (“DOB”), dated May 13 and May 15, 2020, acting on Additional Information Type 1 Application Nos. 520191916 and 520191907, reads, in pertinent part:

Proposed self-storage warehouse (UG 16) with access provided through an (R3-2) zoning district is contrary to Section 22-10 (ZR)....

The street giving access to the proposed building is not duly placed on the official map of the City of New York therefore:

1. No certificate of occupancy can be issued pursuant to Article 3, Section 36 of General City Law.
2. Proposed construction does not have at least 8% of the total perimeter of building fronting directly upon a legally mapped street or frontage space contrary to Sec 01.3.1 of the 2008 NYC Building Code.

This is an application for a variance, pursuant to Z.R. § 72-21, and a waiver of General City Law (“GCL”) § 36 to permit the development of two, Use Group (“UG”) 16, self-storage warehouses, located on a site not fronting on a mapped street, and contrary to the zoning requirements for use (Z.R. § 22-10).

A public hearing was held on this application on December 6, 2022, after due notice by publication in *The City Record*, with a continued hearing on March 13, 2023, and then to decision on May 21,

2024. Vice-Chair Scibetta performed an inspection of the site and the surrounding area.

Community Board 2, Staten Island, recommends denial of this application, stating:

Community Board 2 opposes the application because the only access to the proposed self-storage facility would be via one street line with homes that traverses a residential neighborhood. We are also concerned about insufficient parking, security, and a 24/7 business operation immediately adjacent to said residential facility.

The Board also received 27 letters of objection to this application, including one from New York Assemblyperson Malliotakis, citing concerns about lack of adherence of the proposal to the neighborhood context and drainage; the potential for increased flooding, vermin, and traffic; and the loss of quiet enjoyment.

**I.**

The Premises are an irregularly shaped lot, located at the southeast intersection of Ridgeway Avenue and Riche Avenue, partially within a R3-2 zoning district, partially within an M1-1 zoning district, and wholly within a Lower Density Growth Management Area (“LDGMA”), on Staten Island. The subject zoning lot consists of two areas: the residential portion, within the R3-2 zoning district, with approximately 108,996 square feet of lot area and currently occupied by 48 existing, single-family residences; and the proposed development site, within the M1-1 zoning district, with approximately 400 feet of frontage along Ridgeway Avenue, an irregular depth measuring 247 feet at its deepest, 118,158 square feet of lot area and is currently vacant.

**II.**

The applicant proposes to construct two, two-story, UG 16, self-storage, warehouse buildings within the M1-1 zoning district portion of the lot. The applicant plans to operate the self-storage facilities where individuals would be able to access rented units at their convenience. Specifically, the applicant represents that the first warehouse, to be located at 95 Ridgeway Avenue (“Building A”) on the eastern portion of the subject lot, abutting Ridgeway Avenue, would have 46,235 square feet of floor area; and the second warehouse to be located at 105 Ridgeway Avenue (“Building B”) on the southern portion of the subject site with 37,100 square feet of floor area for a total square footage of 83,335 square feet (0.70 FAR). The applicant also states that it would provide seven accessory parking spaces and four loading berths to be located internal to Building A but does not anticipate activities at the site to require the use of a loading berth. The applicant

further notes that both structures would otherwise comply with the bulk requirements of the underlying district, including any LDGMA provisions, and no portion of the proposed buildings or parking would be located in the R3-2 zoning district portion of the tax lot. However, the applicant maintains that access to the proposed facilities is only possible through the adjacent residential district, contrary to applicable district regulations.

### III.

In the subject R3-2 zoning district, the Zoning Resolution prohibits UG 16 warehouse use (Z.R. § 22-10).

Finally, GCL § 36(2) states, in pertinent part:

A city having a population of one million or more....No certificate of occupancy shall be issued in such city for any building unless a street or highway giving access to such structure has been duly placed on the official map or plan, which street or highway, and any other mapped street or highway abutting such building or structure shall have been suitably improved to the satisfaction of the department of transportation of the city in accordance with standards and specifications approved by such department as adequate in respect to the public health, safety and general welfare for the special circumstances of the particular street or highway, or, alternately, unless the owner has furnished to the department of transportation of such city a performance bond naming the city as obligee, approved by such department, to the full cost of such improvement as estimated by such department, or other security approved by such department, that such improvement will be completed within the time specified by such department....Where the enforcement of the provisions of this section would entail practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship, and where the circumstances of the case do not require the structure to be related to existing or proposed streets or highways, the applicant for such a certificate of occupancy may appeal from the decision of the administrative officer having charge of the issuance of certificates of occupancy to the board of standards and appeals or other similar board of such city having power to make variances or exceptions in zoning regulations, and the same provisions are hereby applied to such appeals and to such board as are provided in cases of appeals on zoning regulations. Accordingly, the applicant seeks the relief requested herein.

### IV.

The Zoning Resolution vests the Board with wide discretion to “vary or modify [its] provision[s] so that the spirit of the law shall be

observed, public safety secured and substantial justice done.” Z.R. § 72-21.

A.

First, the applicant submits that there are unique physical conditions inherent in the Premises—namely, the irregular shape, interior location, and split-zoned conditions of the subject lot—that create practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship in complying strictly with applicable zoning regulations that are not created by general circumstances in the neighborhood or district. The applicant begins by claiming that development of the manufacturing parcel is limited to uses that would be permitted in both the R3-2 and M1-1 zoning districts due to the necessary access through the R3-2 zoning district. Further, the applicant points out that, under the Zoning Resolution, there are very few uses permitted within both the M1-1 and R3-2 zoning districts that could be developed on an as-of-right basis on the subject Premises, noting that a community facility building, such as a medical facility or a clinic, would be the most likely development possibility. However, the applicant represents that development of the subject site with a complying community facility building would not be feasible, as a provision of the required accessory parking spaces limits the size of any conforming and complying community facility building. In support, the applicant submitted as-of-right plans, which demonstrate that a minimum of 57 accessory parking spaces would be required for a 25,666 square-foot, two-story, community facility building with parking located at grade, thereby limiting the potential size of the structure on the subject site. Here, the applicant declares that this as-of-right structure would necessitate a significant amount of paved area to support the required parking, or with a building design wherein the parking would be located beneath an elevated, two-story building, an as-of-right building would still be limited in development scope as the buildable area of the subject site would be constrained due to a mapped freshwater boundary, adjacent area, and the accompanying wetlands’ requirements.

As per the GCL § 36 requirements, the applicant maintains that practical difficulties and unnecessary hardship arise from strict application of the Zoning Resolution to the subject site which is a split-zoned lot with no direct access from a City mapped street to the manufacturing-zoned portion of the lot. The applicant notes that the unique location of the subject site relates to a historical mapped street known as the Victory Boulevard Extension that was never built and would most likely never be built due to its location proximate to freshwater wetlands and current area conditions. Furthermore, the applicant represents that the proposed buildings would front only on an extension of existing Ridgeway Avenue, a privately-owned, currently open, record street, that is improved to a width of 38 feet and provides access to several existing buildings. Moreover, the applicant

states that there are no other mapped or unmapped streets bordering the property, therefore it would not be possible to provide alternate access via an existing mapped, public, or private street except for Ridgeway Avenue, and development of the lot does not require the proposed structure to be related to any existing mapped streets or highways as existing Ridgeway Avenue is paved and improved to the point of access for the two proposed buildings and no additional street or road is required to provide access to the self-storage warehouses. Moreover, the applicant maintains that other lots in the vicinity of the site that are located in comparable manufacturing districts all have direct access through a manufacturing district, but for three lots within subject Block 2610 – Lot 150 (subject lot), Lot 314, and Lot 200, with Lot 200 in the ownership of the City of New York.

Next, the applicant states that access to the proposed buildings would be via two curb cuts on Ridgeway Avenue that provide entry onto a looped driveway that is proposed to be paved and improved to a 30-foot width, with the proposed buildings would be screened from adjacent uses through proposed planting areas and designed to comply and conform to all pertinent provisions of the New York City Fire Code and Building Code.

In discussing the existing, residential developments adjacent to the proposed development, the applicant notes that this prior development included the creation of Calvanico Lane and a privately owned extension of Ridgeway Avenue that provides access from Riche Avenue to the north, a public street with a CCO, issued in July 2000. The applicant represents that creation of Calvanico Lane and the privately owned extension of Ridgeway Avenue included provisions for access to the manufacturing portion of the site accompanied by a plan that included disclosure of the sponsor's plans and right to construct a "lateral, residential mini-storage facility" on the subject Premises, with access to be provided over the private roadway easement. However, the applicant maintains that no changes to the current access to existing residential residences at Ridgeway Avenue is planned as the proposed buildings would be located to the south of existing improved Ridgeway Avenue.

Accordingly, the Board finds that these unique physical conditions create practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship in complying strictly with applicable zoning regulations and constitute a hardship under GCL § 36 that are not created by general circumstances in the neighborhood or district.

**B.**

Next, the applicant submits that, in the absence of the grant of the variance requested in this application, it would not be possible for the Premises to provide a reasonable return on investment. In support of this contention, the applicant submitted an Economic Analysis Report

(the “Report”), in which the applicant argues that the expected value of the capitalized net operating income of \$18,300,000 less total project development cost of \$18,200,000 for the proposed self-storage warehouses development scenario results in a projected value of \$100,000. In contrast, the Report illustrates that the capitalized value of \$5,529,000 less total project development cost of \$16,746,000 for the two-story, as-of-right community facility would be a projected value of -\$11,217,000, due to the unique location conditions affecting the subject site that limit development options to uses permitted in both the M1-1 and R3-2 zoning districts because of the required access to the subject site. As such, the applicant concludes that an as-of-right community facility building would have significantly less project value than the proposed development. Accordingly, the Board finds that because of the unique physical conditions at the Premises, there is no reasonable possibility that the development of the zoning lot in strict conformity with the provisions of the Zoning Resolution would bring a reasonable return.

C.

The applicant represents that the requested variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property, nor be detrimental to the public welfare. First, the applicant reiterates that the use proposed at the subject site would be allowed as of right but for the required access through the adjacent residential district. The applicant also stresses that, as proposed, the two warehouses would only be adjacent to the rear yards of residential development to the north, and the owners of these residences are on notice of the planned development of the self-storage warehouses pursuant to the Homeowners’ Association agreements.

Furthermore, the applicant claims that of the UG 16 uses generally permitted in M1-1 zoning districts, the proposed self-storage warehouses are among the least intensive uses, with minimal expected traffic to the warehouses and limited, daily activity. In support, the applicant provided data prepared by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, which found that per common trip generation, a “mini warehouse”, such as the proposed, would generate 0.26 expected trips per unit (1000 square feet) in contrast to 5.18 expected trips per unit for a medical clinic, community facility use.

Additionally, the applicant states that several design measures have been taken to limit trips to the subject site. For example, the applicant describes that 1) the access lane adjacent to the buildings would be designated as one-way with the entrance and exit located to limit traffic in the adjacent area; 2) “No idling” signs in addition to “right turn only” signage directing visitors from the site to Ridgeway Avenue rather than Calvanico Lane; 3) a structural clutter bar to

prohibit large vehicles from entering the site; 4) hours of operation limited from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., and 5) a building design with no storage unit entrances or loading areas proposed to be located directly on Ridgeway Avenue and activity centered on the interior of the lot. Further, the applicant notes that significant screening is proposed for the subject site, including rooftop planters and area specific planting, so as to minimize any impact the proposed facilities would have on the residential buildings to the north, and the development would be designed to grade so as to direct run off away from adjacent developed sites northeast of the subject site to mitigate any potential drainage or flooding issues.

Accordingly, the Board finds that the proposed variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or district in which the Premises are located; will not substantially impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property; and will not be detrimental to the public welfare.

**D.**

The applicant represents that the above practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship have not been created by the applicant or by a predecessor in title and are due to the strict application of the Zoning Resolution to the subject zoning lot, specifically noting the Premises' location as an interior lot in an M1-1 zoning district with no frontage on a legally mapped street. Furthermore, the applicant points out that the subject site's location was not created by the owner or a predecessor in title and is a condition inherent to the subject site, as the split zoning lot and the district boundary has been consistent since its establishment on December 15, 1961. Accordingly, the Board finds that the above practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships have not been created by the applicant or by a predecessor in title.

**E.**

The applicant claims that the instant variance request is the minimum necessary to develop a feasible building at the Premises and to allow the reasonable use of the property. Here, the applicant reiterates that the proposed development of two, self-storage warehouses with a total 83,335 square feet of floor area (0.70 FAR) would be as of right in the underlying manufacturing district but for the access required through the neighboring residential zoning district. Accordingly, the Board finds that the proposed variance is the minimum necessary to afford relief within the intent and purposes of the Zoning Resolution.

IV.

Over the course of hearings and in response to community comments, the Board raised concerns about the proposed project's adherence to neighborhood context and directed the applicant to detail the buffering between the warehouses and the existing residences in the surrounding area. Additionally, the Board requested the applicant address the security concerns and the potential for flooding due to the Premises' location near a freshwater wetlands' area.

In support, the applicant provided a landscaping study prepared by a landscape architect and revised plans for the proposed buildings with an operational plan to address any potential impact on the nearest residential development and includes measures to mitigate any such impact, such as: a) additional street trees along Ridgeway Avenue in excess of requirements for a total of 21 trees, an increase from the 16 trees originally depicted adjacent to the development site; b) rooftop planting boxes to facilitate the growth of hanging plants and supplement the cover provided by street trees; c) ecosystem-appropriate ground planting; and d) additional internal landscaped areas adjacent to the proposed 105 Ridgeway Avenue building.

Furthermore, at hearing, the applicant represented that the proposed buildings would be developed across Ridgeway Avenue and adjacent to the rear yards of the residential buildings west of the site, providing a distance of 68 feet, at minimum, between the nearest proposed building and the existing buildings. Finally, the applicant claims that the proposed landscaping has been designed to supplement the buffer created by the already significant distance through the addition of additional cover for the height of the proposed building.

In response to the concerns about security, the applicant submitted a site security proposal prepared by its site security consultant, which noted that specific equipment may vary based on current availability and technology and included all measure planned to ensure site safety and security.

In response to the questions surrounding flooding and drainage, the applicant provided a letter from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("DEC"), dated October 19, 2019, which granted the applicant a permit under the number 2-6402-00280/0002 allowing the commencement of the proposed project at the subject Premises as well as with the approved plans.

V.

By correspondence March 11, 2023, the Fire Department, Bureau of Operations, states that it has reviewed the application materials, and a preliminary review shows compliance with all applicable rules and regulations of the Fire Department of the City of New York concerning fire apparatus access roads and entry gates to the

development shall comply with the 2022 NYC Fire Code Sections 503-2-.8. It is understood that all legal requirements, including those outlined in the 2022 New City Construction codes must be complied with by the applicant. Bases upon the foregoing, the Fire Department hereby issues a “Letter of No Objection” to the application. If conditions are found not to comply with the NYC Fire Code, the Fire Department will notify the Board of Standards and Appeals of such non-compliance.

In addition, the applicant is also required to call the Bureau of Facilities Management, Plant Operations Engineering office to schedule an appointment to evaluate its plans for any municipal fire alarm box requirements. To expediate their review, please provide a survey of all fire alarm facilities (alarm boxes and FDNY manholes) within a two-block radius of the development. If no boxes exist within 1,000 feet of the site, please indicate all utility poles with their identifications.

It is understood that all legal requirements, including those set forth in the New York City Fire Code and the New York City Construction Codes must be complied with by the applicant.

## VI.

The project is classified as an Unlisted action pursuant to Section 617.2 of 6 NYCRR. The Board has conducted an environmental review of the proposed action and has documented relevant information about the project in the Final EAS CEQR No. 20BSA095R, dated May 21, 2024. The EAS documents that the project as proposed would not have significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, and public policy; socioeconomic conditions; community facilities and services; open space; shadows; historic resources; urban design and visual resources; neighborhood character; natural resources; waterfront revitalization program; infrastructure; hazardous materials; solid waste and sanitation services; energy; traffic and parking; transit and pedestrians; air quality; noise; or public health.

By letter dated May 17, 2024, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (“DEP”), Bureau of Environmental Planning and Analysis states that it has reviewed the Noise and Air Quality sections of the EAS dated May 2024 for the application and have the following comments:

### **Air Quality:**

Based on the air quality analysis performed for the proposed project, DEP has concluded that there would be no significant adverse impacts from air quality. Based on mobile sources, the Proposed Project would not result in 170 or more auto trips or HDDV traffic. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts from mobile sources. Based on the detailed analysis for stationary sources, the Applicant has proposed the stack for the HVAC system and hot water equipment on Building A to be located at a height of 37.4 feet above

grade to avoid any potential significant adverse air quality impacts to the adjacent or nearby buildings. The Applicant has proposed the HVAC system and hot water equipment stack on Building B to be located at a minimum of 37.4 feet above grade, and that the stack is located at least 40 feet from the western lot line of Block 2610, Lot 150 and at least 40 feet from the southern lot line of Block 2610, Lot 150 to avoid any potential significant adverse air quality impacts. It is noted that although the meteorological data used in the detailed analysis from 2016-2020 is not the most recent version, the modeled concentrations are well below the impact thresholds and is not expected to have significant adverse air quality impacts with the more recent meteorological data. Lastly, there are no industrial sources within 400 feet or major or large sources of emissions within 1,000 feet of the Proposed Project, therefore there is no potential for significant adverse impacts from major or large sources in the surrounding area. In conclusion, as it pertains to mobile, stationary, and industrial sources, there would be no significant adverse air quality impacts on the Proposed Project itself or on the surrounding area.

**Noise:**

Based on the Conditions and Plans set forth by the BSA and listed below, DEP has concluded that there would be no significant adverse impacts pertaining to mobile or stationary noise sources. Project-generated traffic would not double vehicular traffic on nearby roadways, and therefore would not result in a perceptible increase in vehicular noise. Additionally, the BSA Conditions and Plans should be included as Appendix F: Noise in the EAS.

1. Posting signage on the interior of the site that "Idling of vehicles is not permitted on the subject property".
2. Site shall only be accessible by passenger vehicles, vans, or light trucks.
3. Vehicular entry will only be permitted along the eastern ingress of the property (near Building A). Exits will only be permitted at the western egress of the property (near Building B). Insert arrows showing clearly it is one way traffic on the interior roadway of the property. Remove right turn only sign at eastern entrance. Add signage that says, "entry only" and "exit only" at the relevant egresses. With these conditions in place, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant adverse noise impact.

By correspondence dated May 21, 2024, the NYC Department of City Planning ("DCP"), Division of Climate and Sustainability Planning on behalf of the New York City Coastal Commission, states that it has reviewed the waterfront aspect of this action, and based on the information submitted, the Climate and Sustainability Planning Division, hereby concurs that the actions will not substantially hinder the achievement of any Waterfront Revitalization Program ("WRP") policy. This determination is only applicable to the information

received and the current proposal. Any additional information or project modifications, including modifications requested by NYS DEC as a condition for permit approval, would require an independent consistency review. For your records, this project has been assigned WRP #22-169.

No other significant effects upon the environment that would require an Environmental Impact Statement are foreseeable. Accordingly, the Board has determined that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment.

## VII.

Based on the foregoing, the Board finds that the evidence in the record supports the findings required to be made under Z.R. § 72-21 and GCL § 36 and that the applicant has substantiated a basis to warrant exercise of discretion.

*Therefore, it is Resolved,* that the Board of Standards and Appeals does hereby *issue* a Negative Declaration prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and 6 NYCRR Part 617, the Rules of Procedure for City Environmental Quality Review and Executive Order No. 91 of 1997, as amended and makes each and every one of the required findings under Z.R. § 72-21, and does hereby *modify* the decisions of the Department of Buildings, dated May 13 and 15, 2020, acting on Additional Information Type 1 Application Nos. 520191916 and 520191907, under the powers vested in the Board by Section 36 of the General City Law, to *permit* the development two, UG 16, self-storage facilities, which would not front on a mapped street, on a site located partially within an R3-2 zoning district, partially within an M1-1 zoning district, and wholly within a LDGMA, contrary to zoning requirements for use (Z.R. §22-10); *on condition* that all work and site conditions shall conform to drawings filed with this application marked application marked “Approved Plans” — Seven (7) sheets, received April 30, 2024;

THAT only a UG 16, self-service storage facility use shall be permitted on the zoning lot and shall meet the underlying zoning requirements of the proposed use, pursuant to Z.R. § 32-19;

THAT the bulk parameters of the building shall be as follows: a maximum zoning floor area of 83,535 square feet (0.70 FAR) and the maximum size of each individual storage unit shall not exceed 300 square feet, as per the BSA-approved plans;

THAT the hours of operation shall be limited from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m.;

THAT the interior traffic flow shall be one-way, as illustrated on the BSA-approved plans on which vehicular entry will only be permitted along the eastern ingress of the property near Building A and exit will only be permitted at the western egress of the property

**2020-51-BZ, 2020-53-BZ, 2020-52-A, & 2020-54-A**

near Building B and a 10-foot high clutter bar with 14-foot-high structural clearance shall be installed at the eastern entrance of the Premises to prohibit any large trucks from accessing the site;

THAT the applicant shall make improvements to the sidewalk and the curb cut so as to meet NYC DOT standards and planting on the site shall be maintained at all times;

THAT the HVAC type shall comply with all applicable laws and regulations as determined by DOB and other relevant agencies;

THAT BSA is not waiving any applicable New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (“DEC”) rules and regulations applicable to the subject site, including, but not limited to Title 6, Chapter 10 of the New York Codes, Rules and Regulations;

THAT any deviation from the applicable DEC rules or regulations shall be subject to review and approval by NYS DEC;

THAT all conditions are determined by NYS DEC for Article 24, Freshwater Wetland Permit, Application ID Number 2-6403-00280/00002 shall be met;

THAT the above conditions shall be implemented prior to receiving a temporary certificate of occupancy (“TCO”);

THAT the above conditions shall be listed on the certificate of occupancy;

THAT only right turns shall be permitted from the exit, as per the BSA approved plans;

THAT the applicant shall provide signs noting “Entrance Only” and “Exit Only” at relevant access points;

THAT a total of seven vehicular parking spaces and four loading berths for light trucks and vans will be provided onsite;

THAT the owner shall post signage on the interior of the site which states “Idling of vehicles is not permitted on the Premises”;

THAT the HVAC system for Building A shall be located at a height of 37.4 feet above grade and HVAC system for Building B shall be located at a height of 37.4 feet above grade;

THAT the stack for Building B shall be located at least 40 feet from the western lot line of Block 2610, Lot 50 and at least 40 feet from the southern lot line of Block 2610, Lot 150;

THAT the site shall only be accessible by passenger vehicles, vans, or light trucks;

THAT flood regulations, including Article 6, Chapter 4 of the NYC Zoning Resolution and Appendix G of the NYC Building Code, as applicable, shall be complied with as reviewed and approved by the Department of Buildings;

THAT the Department of Buildings must ensure that the Board-approved plans comply to the maximum extent feasible with all applicable zoning regulations as if the unimproved street were not mapped;

THAT this approval is limited to the relief granted by the Board in response to objections cited and filed by the Department of Buildings;

**2020-51-BZ, 2020-53-BZ, 2020-52-A, & 2020-54-A**

THAT the approved plans shall be considered approved only for the portions related to the specific relief granted; and

THAT the Department of Buildings must ensure compliance with all other applicable provisions of the Zoning Resolution, the Administrative Code, and any other relevant laws under its jurisdiction irrespective of plans or configurations not related to the relief granted.

**Adopted by the Board of Standards and Appeals, May 21, 2024.**

**CERTIFICATION**

**This copy of the resolution  
dated May 21, 2024  
is hereby filed by the  
Board of Standards and Appeals  
on July 19, 2024.**



**Carlo Costanza  
Executive Director**